

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

RUTH JARRETT-COOPER, ET AL.,

No. 11-13674

Plaintiffs,

District Judge Lawrence P. Zatkoff

v.

Magistrate Judge R. Steven Whalen

UNITED AIR LINES, INC.,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER**

On July 2, 2013, Plaintiffs filed a motion for reconsideration [Doc. #135] of my June 24, 2013 order denying Plaintiff's motion to compel discovery [Doc. #132]. I ordered Defendant United Airlines, Inc. to file a response to this motion, which it did on July 16, 2013 [Doc. #138]. Plaintiff filed a reply to the response on July 18, 2013 [Doc. #139].

Motions for reconsideration are subject to E.D. Mich. L.R. 7.1(g)(3), which provides:

“(3) *Grounds*. Generally, and without restricting the court's discretion, the court will not grant motions for rehearing or reconsideration that merely present the same issues ruled upon by the court, either expressly or by reasonable implication. The movant must not only demonstrate a palpable defect by which the court and the parties have been misled but also show that correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case.”

Having revisited my previous order and reviewed the pleadings, I am of the view that Plaintiff has not met the demanding standard of L.R. 7.1(g)(3) in that she has not demonstrated a palpable defect by which the Court and the parties have been misled, or

that correcting any defect would result in a different disposition of the original motion.<sup>1</sup>

Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration [Doc. #135] is therefore DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated September 30, 2013

s/ R. Steven Whalen  
R. STEVEN WHALEN  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was sent to parties of record on September 30, 2013, electronically and/or by U.S. mail.

s/Michael Williams  
Case Manager to the  
Honorable R. Steven Whalen

---

<sup>1</sup> I disagree that a motion for reconsideration of a Magistrate Judge's order must necessarily be addressed to the District Judge. The judicial officer who enters an order—in this case, a Magistrate Judge—may correct errors in his or her own order under the purview of the Local Rules, where a timely motion for reconsideration is filed. Once reconsideration is denied (or for that matter, granted) by the Magistrate Judge, the non-prevailing party may then file objections with the District Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A).